

## REMARKS

Claim 24 has been canceled without prejudice. Claim 22 has been amended. New claims 30-33 have been added. Claims 22-23 and 25-33 are currently pending. Entry of the amendments, and reexamination and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

First, Applicant notes the Examiner's request for a new title. Applicant is willing to change the title, and possible titles that immediately come to Applicant's mind include "Non-Spill Bubble Container" or "Bubble Solution Container". However, Applicant has no idea what title the Examiner might deem to be appropriate, so Applicant invites the Examiner to suggest a title.

Second, Applicant has responded to the Section 112 rejections by amending claim 22 to recite that the stopper has "a shaft having a first end and a second end, with a serrated bubble ring provided at the first end and a support section provided at the second end, wherein a lining is provided around a portion of a support section". This recitation is clearly supported by FIG. 8 and page 5, lines 23-34 of the specification. Thus, all pending claims are submitted to be in compliance with Section 112.

Third, claims 22-24 and 27 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over certain claims of USP 6,857,928. Claims 1-4 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over certain claims of USP 6,595,822. Claims 1-7 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over certain claims of USP 6,638,131. In response, Applicant does not understand these rejections since claims 1-7 have been canceled, and there are no such claims pending. Applicant will re-consider these obviousness-type double patenting rejections after the Examiner clarifies these rejections.

Fourth, Applicant shall respond to the substantive rejections as follows.

Claims 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 2,858,639 to Lawrence ("Lawrence"). Claims 22-24 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 5,282,541 to Chen ("Chen"). Claims 22-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,273,172 to Rossbach et al. ("Rossbach") in view of Chen. These rejections respectfully traversed.

### Claim 22

Independent claim 22 has been amended to include the recitation of claim 24, i.e.,

a lid pivotably coupled to the top wall and covering the opening. Lawrence does not teach or suggest a lid pivotably coupled to the top wall of the container body and covering the opening in the top wall. Thus, amended claim 22 is allowable over Lawrence.

In addition, claim 22 has been amended to recite a serrated bubble ring provided at the first end of the shaft of the stopper. In contrast, neither Chen nor Rossbach teach or suggest a serrated bubble ring. In fact, neither Chen nor Rossbach are even directed to a bubble producing device. Chen and Rossbach are both directed to drinking containers. In addition, Lawrence does not teach or suggest a serrated bubble ring provided at an end of its shaft 18. Thus, amended claim 22, and claims 23 and 25-29 depending therefrom, are submitted to be allowable over all the cited references.

#### Claims 30-33


Applicant has added new independent claim 30, which also recites a serrated bubble ring provided at the first end of the shaft of the stopper. For the reasons explained above in connection with claim 22, none of the cited references teach or suggest a serrated bubble ring provided at the first end of the shaft of the stopper.

Claim 30 also recites that the lining is made of rubber. In contrast, none of the elements 51-55 in Chen are made of rubber. In addition, neither Lawrence nor Rossbach teach or suggest anything that can be remotely considered to be a rubber lining.

Thus, claim 30, and claims 31-33 depending therefrom, are submitted to be allowable over all the cited references.

In light of the above reasons, all pending claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any proposed amendments or informalities that can be resolved in a phone interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Raymond Sun  
Attorney for Applicant  
12420 Woodhall Way  
Tustin, CA 92782  
Tel: 949-252-9180

#### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Date: October 19, 2005

By: 

Raymond Sun